

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS FO Box 1430 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.tepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/771,669	02/04/2004	Yoo-shin Lee	P2072US	3595
8968 DRINKER BI	7590 06/16/2009 DDLE & REATH LLP		EXAMINER	
ATTN: PATENT DOCKET DEPT.			WANG, KENT F	
191 N. WACK CHICAGO, II	ER DRIVE, SUITE 3700 . 60606		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	
			2622	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/16/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Interview Summary

| Application No. | Applicant(s) | 10/771,669 | LEE ET AL. |
| Examiner | Art Unit | KENT WANG | 2622 |

	KENT WANG	2622					
All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO	personnel):						
(1) <u>KENT WANG</u> .	(3)Mark Bergner.						
(2) <u>Tuan Ho</u> .	(4)						
Date of Interview: 15 June 2009.							
Type: a)⊠ Telephonic b)□ Video Conference c)□ Personal [copy given to: 1)□ applicant 2	2)∏ applicant's representative	e]					
Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes If Yes, brief description:	e)⊠ No.						
Claim(s) discussed: <u>1</u> .							
Identification of prior art discussed: Nishimura and Kerai.							
Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached.) was not reached. h) № N	I/A.					
Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) NA. Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Mr. Mark Bergner explained several key features which are releated to the technica concept of the invention. Mr. Bergner further explained the differential features between the invention and the prior arts. Applicant will submit a formal argument/generinend and an evaluation between the invention and prior arts will be perform and further consideration will be required. (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.) THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.							
/Tuan V Ho/							